certainly aware of Hübner's *Sammlung europäischer Schmetterlinge*, making frequent reference throughout his text to plates and figures in that work. However, in none of Curtis's folios published before 1835 is there a direct or indirect reference to the *Verzeichniss bekannter Schmettlinge*, which is the only work of Hübner relevant to this case. In 1835, that is eight years after the publication of *Glyphipteryx*, and subsequently, Curtis includes genera from Hübner's *Verzeichniss* in his synonymies. Moreover, in folio 563, published 1 September 1835, Curtis stated with reference to *Cynaeda* Hübner, [1825], *Verzeichniss*, p. 346, 'I indicated this peculiar insect as a Genus in my Guide, unconscious at that time of Hübner having done so before me. . .'. The *Guide* referred to was published in 1829—[1831], and the part relevant to this case appeared in [1831], four years after the publication of *Glyphipteryx*. In this *Guide* there is further indirect evidence to show that as late as 1831 Curtis was unaware of the existence of Hübner's *Verzeichniss*.

Curtis used the term 'Nobis' to indicate new taxa as well as emendations; however, in the latter case he invariably cites the emended name as well; for example '*Argyromiges* Nob. — *Argyromis* Ste.' (1829, folio 284) or '*Radiellus* Nobis. — *radiella* Hüb. Schmet.' (1826, folio 109). No such reference is made under *Glyphipteryx*.

In folio 535 (published 1 February 1835) Curtis accepted the name *Harpipterix* Hübner, [1825], *Verzeichniss*, p. 407, citing it exclusively (four times) in this spelling. Moreover, he specifically stated 'I have therefore adopted Hübner's name of *Harpipterix* (Scythe-winged)'.

The contention that *Glyphipterix* Hübner, [1825], and *Glyphipteryx* Curtis, 1827, were confused in the past, or are likely to be confused in the future, seems almost irrelevant as these taxa are widely separated in the classification of the Lepidoptera. Similar cases of close orthography exist in generic names elsewhere, and as there is no evidence of confusion in the current literature there is no justification to suppress *Glyphipteryx* Curtis, 1827.

In view of these facts we believe that this case is best resolved without recourse to the plenary powers, as outlined in our previous proposal in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 35, p. 72, which we re-submit in full for reconsideration by the Commission.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSALS TO REMOVE THE HOMONYMY BETWEEN CAECILIIDAE IN AMPHIBIA AND INSECTA (PSOCOPTERA) Z.N.(S.)2333

(see vol. 40, pp. 124–128)

By Marvalee H. Wake (*Department of Zoology, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, U.S.A.*)

I support the initial proposal offered by R. A. Nussbaum and E. Mockford as published in vol. 40, pp. 124–128. The family names proposed by Nussbaum and Mockford have the utility of simplicity and discrete association with the members they represent. I see Smith & Polhemus' point about the absence of a nominal genus with the spelling implied by the family name CAECILIONIDAE, but find the arguments about potential problems less than compelling. The arguments for both the formal and vernacular names suggested by Smith & Polhemus pose spelling and pronunciation problems, and lack the clarity of association and discrete separation of the

names proposed by Nussbaum & Mockford. While utility might not be the most impressive argument to nomenclatural purists, I can assure you that it has great appeal to those of us, who, as in this case, are the primary 'users' of such a classification.